

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SHAWN EVANS, 11-A-0681,

Plaintiff,

v.

DECISION AND ORDER
13-CV-805A

CORRECTION OFFICER M. BALMER, et al.,

Defendants.

The above-referenced case was referred to Magistrate Judge Hugh B. Scott, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). On December 1, 2015, Magistrate Judge Scott filed a Decision and Order (Dkt. No. 56) granting plaintiff Evans' motion to compel (Dkt. No. 42) to the extent that defendants were required to provide plaintiff with an extra copy of Docket Nos. 19-24, 31-25, 20 and 41. Plaintiff's motion was denied in all other respects.

On December 30, 2015, the plaintiff, Shawn Evans, filed objections to the Decision and Order, titling his filing as "MEMORANDUM of Law for Objections to Report and Recommendation." (Dkt. No. 57) Defendants filed a response on January 29, 2015 (Dkt. No. 59), and plaintiff Evans filed a reply on March 3, 2016. Dkt. No. 63. The Court has deemed the matter submitted without oral argument.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(A), the Court must review whether the Decision and Order is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon such review, and after reviewing the submissions from the parties, the Court hereby affirms Magistrate Judge Scott's Decision and Order.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth in Magistrate Judge Scott's Decision and Order (Dkt. No. 56), plaintiff's motion to compel is granted only to the extent that defendants are required to provide plaintiff with an additional copy of the docket entries as indicated above, but is otherwise denied. The matter remains with Magistrate Judge Scott for further pretrial proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Richard J. Arcara

HONORABLE RICHARD J. ARCARA
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Dated: April 21, 2016